

1 Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805  
2 Email: mram@rocklawcal.com  
3 RAM, OLSON, CEREGHINO  
4 & KOPCZYNSKI LLP  
5 101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1800  
6 San Francisco, California 94104  
7 Telephone: (415) 433-4949  
8 Facsimile: (415) 433-7311

9  
10 Beth E. Terrell, SBN #178181  
11 Email: bterrell@terrellmarshall.com  
12 Kerem M. Levitas  
13 Email: klevitas@terrellmarshall.com  
14 936 N. 34th Street, Suite 300  
15 Seattle, Washington 98103  
16 Telephone: (206) 816-6603  
17 Facsimile: (206) 319-5450

18 [Additional Counsel Appear on Signature Page]

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
698  
699  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
797  
798  
799  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
897  
898  
899  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
988  
989  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
997  
998  
999  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1088  
1089  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1188  
1189  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1288  
1289  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1388  
1389  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1488  
1489  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1588  
1589  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1688  
1689  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1788  
1789  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. PARTIES .....	1
III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	2
IV. THE TCPA.....	2
V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS .....	3
A. Both Defendants are Liable for the Illegal Conduct .....	3
B. Defendants Use Authorized Dealers to Generate Business .....	5
C. Alliance Security and its Predecessor are Notorious TCPA Scofflaws.....	8
D. Defendants Expressly Authorized Alliance to Market and Sell Alarm.com Services.....	9
E. Defendants are Vicariously Liable for Alarm.com Dealers' TCPA Violations.....	10
F. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Abante .....	11
G. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Manesiotis .....	13
H. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Hankins .....	14
I. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Charvat.....	15
VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS .....	18
VII. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF .....	22
VIII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF .....	23
IX. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF .....	24

1	X. FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF .....	25
2	XI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF .....	25
3	XII. DEMAND FOR JURY .....	27
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. Defendant Alarm.com, Inc. is a publicly traded company that sells home-monitoring hardware and subscriptions to wireless home-security monitoring systems. To generate subscribers, Alarm.com relies on a network of third-party authorized dealers, one of which has a notorious history of generating sales through illegal telemarketing, having paid millions in fines to government agencies for telemarketing violations. Despite knowledge of this dealer's practices, Alarm.com expressly authorized it to promote and sell Alarm.com products and services using Alarm.com sales contracts and the Alarm.com name.

2. Plaintiffs are consumers and a small business who received illegal Alarm.com telemarketing calls as a result of this principal-agent relationship. Under established principles of vicarious liability, Alarm.com is legally responsible for the calls, which violate federal telemarketing law.

3. Accordingly, on behalf of persons and entities who also received Alarm.com telemarketing calls at their homes or on their cellular telephones, Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, which prohibits autodialed and prerecorded telemarketing calls and calls to numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry unless the caller has the recipient's written permission. Plaintiffs request relief including an injunction to end these practices, and an award to class members of the statutory damages for each illegal call.

## II. PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Abante Rooter and Plumbing, Inc. is a foreign corporation based in California, with its principal place of business in Alameda County, California.

5. Plaintiff George Ross Manesiotis is a citizen of Florida, residing in Palm Beach County, Florida.

6. Plaintiff Mark Hankins is a citizen of Florida, residing in Land O'Lakes County, Florida.

1 7. Plaintiff Philip J. Charvat is a citizen of Ohio, residing in Franklin County, Ohio.

2 8. Defendant Alarm.com Holdings, Inc. (“Holdings”) is a Delaware Corporation  
3 with its principal place of business in Vienna, Virginia. Defendant Holdings is engaged in  
4 substantial and not isolated business activities in the State of California and the United States.

5 9. Defendant Alarm.com Incorporated (“Incorporated”), is a subsidiary of  
6 Alarm.com Holdings, Inc. Defendant Incorporated is a Delaware Corporation with its principal  
7 place of business in Vienna, Virginia. Defendant Incorporated is engaged in substantial and not  
8 isolated business activities in the State of California and the United States, including, but not  
9 limited to, engaging in contractual relationships with companies that make telemarketing calls  
10 into California, and then entering into contractual relationships and servicing the relationships  
11 with new customers that result from those telemarketing calls.

### 12 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 10. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because  
14 Plaintiffs’ claims arise under the laws of the United States.

15 11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they operate,  
16 conduct, engage in, and/or carry on, business activities in this District and a substantial part of  
17 the wrongful acts alleged in this Complaint were committed in California.

18 12. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2) because Plaintiff Abamte resides in  
19 this District and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims  
20 occurred in this District.

### 21 **IV. THE TCPA**

22 13. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA in response to a growing number of  
23 consumer complaints regarding certain telemarketing practices.

24 14. The TCPA makes it unlawful “to make any call (other than a call made for  
25 emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an

automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... to any telephone number assigned to a ... cellular telephone service.” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

15. Additionally, the TCPA makes it unlawful “to initiate any telephone call to any residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the called party, unless the call is initiated for emergency purposes[.]” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

16. The TCPA also makes it unlawful for any entity to make more than one call in a 12-month period to any number that is registered with the National Do Not Call Registry or the entity's company specific do-not-call list. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2) & (d).

17. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of these provisions. *See* 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(b)(3), (c).

18. A seller of goods or services can be liable for TCPA violations even if the seller does not directly place or initiate the calls.

19. Regulations of the Federal Communication Commission (“FCC”) “generally establish that the party on whose behalf a solicitation is made bears ultimate responsibility for any violations.” *See Rules and Regs. Implementing the Telephone Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, Mem. and Order, 10 FCC Rcd. 12391, 12397 ¶ 13 (1995).

20. The FCC affirmed this principle in 2013, when it explained that “a seller .... may be held vicariously liable under federal common law principles of agency for violations of either section 227(b) or section 227(c) that are committed by third-party telemarketers.” *See In the Matter of the Jt. Pet. filed by Dish Network, LLC*, 28 F.C.C. Rcd. 6574, 6574 (2013).

## **V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### A. Both Defendants are Liable for the Illegal Conduct.

21. Defendants provide cloud-based home automation, monitoring, and security services.

1       22. Holdings owns and controls Incorporated. Defendants operate a single website,  
2 www.alarm.com, which lists a single set of officers and directors and provides identical  
3 telephone numbers and office locations.

4                   *Holdings Exerts Operational Control Over Incorporated.*

5       23. Holdings' officers and directors direct and control the business strategy and daily  
6 operations of Incorporated, and exert operational control over Incorporated.

7       24. Holdings' officers and directors direct and control Incorporated's sales and  
8 marketing strategy, including the use of illegal telemarketing calls.

9       25. On information and belief, Defendants arbitrarily allocate funds between and  
10 amongst themselves. Holdings pays routine expenses for Incorporated, performs accounting  
11 services for Incorporated, and reports Incorporated's earnings and losses to the SEC and its  
12 shareholders.

13       26. Further, Holdings and Incorporated share assets, revenues, and access to capital.

14       27. For instance, Holdings and Incorporated are parties to the same line of credit  
15 agreement, which it describes as a "Senior Secured Credit Facilities Credit Agreement by and  
16 among the Registrant [that is, Holdings], Alarm.com Incorporated, Silicon Valley Bank, Bank  
17 of America, N.A." Alarm.com Holdings, Inc., Amendment No. 2 to Form S-1: Registration  
18 Statement (Form S-1) (Jan. 15, 2015).

19       28. That credit facility "is available to [Defendants] to finance working capital and  
20 certain permitted acquisitions and investments, and is secured by substantially all of  
21 [Defendants'] assets, including intellectual property." *Id.*

22                   *Defendants Manifest a Unity of Business Interest.*

23       29. Holdings and Incorporated manifest a unity of business interest and hold  
24 themselves out to the public and investors as a single entity.

1           30. Defendants likewise hold themselves out to consumers and conduct business  
2 throughout the United States, including in the State of California, under a single trade name —  
3 Alarm.com.

4           31. For instance, Defendants' website's "Investor FAQs" section states that  
5 "Alarm.com is incorporated in Delaware" making no distinction between Defendants'  
6 purportedly separate corporates entities.

7           32. Incorporated manifests no separate corporate interests of its own and functions  
8 solely to achieve the business purposes and strategy of Holdings.

9           33. Incorporated performs services sufficiently important to Holdings that absent  
10 Incorporated, Holdings would perform those services itself.

11           34. For example, in an SEC filing, Holdings attached as an exhibit a "Dealer Program  
12 Agreement" with Monitronics Funding LP ("Monitronics"). Holdings described that agreement  
13 as "between the Registrant [that is, Holdings] and Monitronics Funding LP." Alarm.com  
14 Holdings, Inc., Securities Registration Statement (Form S-1/A), Ex. 10.11 (June 19, 2015).

15           35. The Dealer Program Agreement is actually between Incorporated and  
16 Monitronics. *Id.*

17           36. Further, Holdings attached as an exhibit to the same filing a consumer home  
18 security system contract that listed only Incorporated, demonstrating that Holdings and  
19 Incorporated act as a single entity.

20 **B. Defendants Use Authorized Dealers to Generate Business.**

21           37. Defendants do not sell their services directly to consumers, but rather partner with  
22 a network of approximately 5,000 security system dealers and service providers ("Service  
23 Providers") throughout the United States, including California.

24           38. Defendants charge Service Providers a fee for each consumer account that a  
25 Service Provider maintains with Defendants' services.

26           39. Further, Defendants require Service Providers to enter into contracts that govern  
27 the Service Providers' interactions with consumers.

1           40. Alarm.com allows the Service Providers to enter into contractual relationships  
 2 with customers.

3           41. For example, the “Dealer Program Agreement” discussed in ¶¶ 33-34, supra,  
 4 between Defendants and Monitronics provided:

5           Alarm.com has entered into agreements with independently owned  
 6 and operated security services dealers who market, sell, install and  
 7 service residential and/or commercial security, monitoring,  
 8 automation and structured wiring products (each an “ADC Dealer”)

9           Alarm.com has authorized the ADC Dealers to market and sell  
 10 Alarm.com Services....

11           The assignment by an ADC Dealer of any rights or obligations  
 12 under an ADC Dealer Agreement requires the advance written  
 13 consent of Alarm.com.

14           42. In a June 15, 2015 SEC filing, Defendant Holdings described Defendants’  
 15 relationship with their Service Providers as follows:

16           We rely on our service provider network to acquire additional  
 17 subscribers, and the inability of our service providers to attract  
 18 additional subscribers or retain their current subscribers could  
 19 adversely affect our operating results. Substantially all of our  
 20 revenue is generated through the sales of our platform and  
 21 solutions by our service providers, and our service providers are  
 22 responsible for subscriber acquisitions, as well as providing  
 23 customer service and technical support for our platform and  
 24 solutions to the subscribers.

25           Alarm.com Holdings, Inc., Amendment No. 2 to Form S-1: Registration Statement (Form S-1)  
 26 (Jan. 15, 2015).

27           43. Defendants thus control details regarding the Service Provider’s sale, installation,  
 1 maintenance, and support of Defendants’ home security systems to consumers.

2           44. Defendants also have significant involvement in and control of their Service  
 3 Providers’ marketing of Defendants’ services.

4           45. For instance, Holdings’ June 15, 2015 SEC filing states that Defendants provide  
 5 Service Providers with “Sales, Marketing & Training” designed “to help effectively promote  
 6 and sell the connected home.” *Id.*

1       46. In a June 30, 2015 SEC filing, Defendant Holdings reaffirmed both Defendants' involvement in the Service Providers' sales and marketing of Defendants' services: "We provide our service providers with specific training and programs to assist them in selling and providing support for our platform and solutions." Alarm.com Holdings, Inc., Quarterly Report (Form 10-Q) (June 30, 2015).

6       47. Defendants' website also provides: "Dealers have access to a library of marketing materials and sales tools to help promote interactive security solutions."

8       48. Part of Defendants' and their Service Partners' strategy for obtaining customers involves the use of an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") and automated or prerecorded messages. These types of calls may violate the TCPA.

11       49. Defendants know that their extensive involvement and control of their Service Providers' sales and telemarketing of Defendants' services makes Defendants potentially liable for their Service Providers' violations of the TCPA.

14       50. Holdings' June 15, 2015 SEC filing recognizes Defendants' exposure under the TCPA:

16       Our business, operations and services providers are subject to various U.S. Federal, state and local consumer protection laws, licensing regulation and other laws and regulations . . . . Our advertising and sales practices and that of our services provider network are subject to regulation by the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, or the FTC, in addition to state consumer protection laws. The FTC and the Federal Communications Commission have issued regulations and place restrictions on, among other things, unsolicited automated telephone calls to residential and wireless telephone subscribers by means of automatic telephone dialing systems and the use of prerecorded or artificial voice messages. If our service providers were to take actions in violation of these regulations, such as telemarketing to individuals on the "Do Not Call" registry, we could be subject to fines, penalties, private actions or enforcement actions by government regulators.

24       Alarm.com Holdings, Inc., Amendment No. 2 to Form S-1: Registration Statement (Form S-1) (Jan. 15, 2015).

26       51. Finally, Defendants exercise control over their Services Providers by retaining the right to discipline and terminate those Service Providers that use illegal telemarketing.

1           **C. Alliance Security and its Predecessor are Notorious TCPA Scofflaws.**

2           52. One of Defendants' Service Providers is a company called Alliance Security.

3           53. Alliance Security, and its predecessor, Versatile Marketing Solutions, Inc.,  
4 ("VMS/Alliance") have a history that spans more than five years of penalties and failure to  
5 adhere to federal and state telemarketing laws.

6           54. In July 2010, the Pennsylvania Attorney General fined VMS/Alliance \$28,000 for  
7 telemarketing in violation of Pennsylvania's Do Not Call registry, and in a settlement agreement  
8 VMS/Alliance admitted to violations of the state telemarketer act. Aaron Evans, "Three  
9 Businesses Fined for 'Do Not Call' Violations," Gant Daily: CNN News Affiliate (June 23,  
10 2010), <http://gantdaily.com/2010/07/23/three-businesses-fined-for-do-not-call-violations/> (last  
11 visited Nov. 27, 2015).

12           55. In January 2012, the Attorney General for the State of Kentucky fined  
13 VMS/Alliance \$20,000 for telemarketing in violation of Kentucky's Do Not Call registry.

14           56. In April 2012, the TODAY show featured an investigative report on the illegal  
15 telemarketing practices of VMS/Alliance. Jeff Rosen and Sandra Thomas, "Rossen Reports:  
16 Telemarketers Ignore Do Not Call List," TODAY (April, 27, 2012),  
17 [http://www.today.com/id/47177020/ns/today-today\\_news/t/rossen-reports-telemarketers-ignore-do-not-call-list/#.VgxBkflVhBc](http://www.today.com/id/47177020/ns/today-today_news/t/rossen-reports-telemarketers-ignore-do-not-call-list/#.VgxBkflVhBc) (last visited Nov. 27, 2015).

18           57. On March 20, 2014, VMS/Alliance and its owner Jasit "Jay" Gotra entered into a  
19 Stipulated Final Order for Permanent Injunction and Civil Penalty Judgment with the Federal  
20 Trade Commission ("FTC"), the government entity charged with federal enforcement of the  
21 TCPA. *See U.S. v. Versatile Marketing Solutions, Inc. and Jasit Gotra*, No. 1:14-cv- 10612 (D.  
22 Mass. Mar. 10, 2014).

23           58. The terms include a \$3.4 million judgment in favor of the FTC against the  
24 Defendant, and an order prohibiting VMS from (i) "Initiating any Outbound Telephone Call to  
25 any person at a telephone number on the National Do Not Call Registry[,]" and (ii) "Initiating  
26

1 any Outbound Telephone Call to a person when that person has previously stated that he or she  
 2 does not wish to receive an Outbound Telephone Call made by.” *Id.*

3 **D. Defendants Expressly Authorized Alliance to Market and Sell Alarm.com Services.**

4 59. Despite Alliance Security’s well-publicized history of TCPA violations,  
 5 Defendants partnered with Alliance Security to promote their services.

6 60. Defendants entered into a Service Partner and/or dealer partner agreement with  
 7 Alliance Security to market, including through telemarketing, their services to consumers.

8 61. Alliance Security’s website advertises that it sells Defendants’ services.

9 62. For example, Alliance Security’s website advertises that it is “Powered by  
 10 Alarm.com” and that “Alarm.com’s Geo-Services lets you know if you left home without  
 11 arming the security system, locking the door or closing the garage.” Alarm.com and Apple  
 12 Watch Home Automation, <http://www.alliancesecurity.com/alarm-com-apple-watch-home-automation/> (last visited Nov. 27, 2015).

13 63. Alliance Security’s equipment and customer service support webpage provides  
 14 detailed instructions on how to use Defendants’ services, including how to configure accounts  
 15 on Defendants’ website, how to elect to receive emails and texts regarding the alarm system  
 16 directly from Defendants, and how to change an Alarm.com password.

17 64. In September 2015, Alliance Security representatives provided Defendants’ home  
 18 security contracts to consumers, including Plaintiff Charvat, during home alarm system  
 19 installation visits.

20 21 65. The contract provides:

22 23 24 25 26 27 Alarm.com...has authorized the Dealer to market and sell  
 Alarm.com’s services (“Services”) to you.  
 [This agreement] constitute[s] the terms and conditions of  
 Alarm.com’s offering of the Equipment and Services (“Terms”)  
 and are part of your agreement with the Dealer.  
 By signing your agreement with the Dealer, accessing the  
 Alarm.com customer website or mobile applications, or using any  
 other part of the Services and/or Equipment, you agree to be bound  
 by these Alarm.com Terms.

1                   You agree that these Alarm.com Terms may be enforced by us  
2                   directly.

3               66. Alliance Security uses ATDS equipment and software that has the capacity to  
4               store or produce telephone numbers to be called and which includes auto-dialers and predictive  
5               dialers.

6               67. Alliance Security used ATDS equipment to call Plaintiffs.

7               68. Alliance Security's calls to Plaintiffs were made for the purpose of marketing  
8               Defendants' services.

9               **E. Defendants are Vicariously Liable for Alarm.com Dealers' TCPA Violations.**

10               69. Defendants are vicariously liable for the conduct of Alliance Security under  
11               ordinary principles of agency because Defendants directed or authorized Alliance Security's  
12               conduct constituting the statutory violations alleged herein.

13               70. Defendants established, approved, or ratified Alliance Security's policies and  
14               practices.

15               71. Defendants accepted the benefits of Alliance Security's and other vendors' illegal  
16               telemarketing campaigns by accepting fees from new consumer accounts, in spite of knowledge  
17               that the new consumer accounts were generated through the making of illegal telemarketing  
18               calls such as those being challenged here.

19               72. Defendants cloaked Alliance Security with apparent/implied authority to act on  
20               their behalf, including but not limited to authorizing Alliance Security to make marketing  
21               telephone calls on their behalf, to advertise that Alliance Security's products were affiliated  
22               with Defendants, and by authorizing Alliance Security to bind Defendants in contract directly  
23               with consumers.

24               73. Defendants had the authority and responsibility to prevent or correct the unlawful  
25               telemarketing practices of Alliance Security and formulated, directed, controlled, and  
26               participated in the acts and practices of Alliance Security that violated the TCPA, including the  
27               acts and practices set forth in this Complaint.

1       74. Under ordinary principles of vicarious liability, Defendants are liable for the  
2 TCPA violations alleged above because they are directly involved in, authorized, or ratified the  
3 Alliance Security operations that violated the TCPA.

4 **F. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Abante.**

5       75. Plaintiff Abante owns a cellular telephone and cellular service with the number  
6 (510) 540-XXXX. This phone is used by Abante's owner, Fred Heidarpour.

7       76. On December 9, 2015, a prerecorded telemarketing call was placed to this  
8 number.

9       77. On information and belief, this call was made by a third party lead generator  
10 authorized by Defendants and Alliance Security to make illegal telemarketing calls to  
11 consumers.

12       78. The call was an interactive pre-recorded message offering home security services.  
13 It provided automated options to reach live operators.

14       79. Mr. Heidarpour chose to be connected to a live operator, who offered to sell him a  
15 home security system.

16       80. The operator stated that his company was affiliated with Alliance Security and  
17 provided products powered by Alarm.com.

18       81. That same day, on the same cellular telephone, Mr. Heidarpour received a second  
19 call from or on behalf of Defendants.

20       82. The caller told Mr. Heidarpour he worked for a company called "Nationwide  
21 Home Alarms" and attempted to sell Mr. Heidarpour a home security system, but the call was  
22 disconnected.

23       83. On information and belief, Nationwide is Nationwide Alarms, LLC, a third party  
24 lead generator that Defendants authorized Alliance Security to hire for purposes of  
25 telemarketing Defendants' services.

26       84. On December 11, 2015, Mr. Heidarpour received another call on the cellular  
27 phone from Nationwide.

1 85. This call began with a distinctive pause consistent with an ATDS.

2 86. After the pause, a representative named “Mason Slaton” came on the line and  
3 again attempted to sell a home security system.

4 87. The agent repeated that his company was affiliated with Alliance Security, and  
5 that Mr. Heidarpour could control the home security system through a mobile application  
6 powered by Alarm.com.

7 88. Between December 11 and December 14, 2015, Mr. Heidarpour exchanged  
8 emails with Mr. Slaton regarding the products and services Mr. Slaton was selling.

9 89. Through these emails, Mr. Heidarpour learned that Nationwide’s “parent  
10 company” is Alliance Security, that Nationwide is located in Pawtucket, Rhode Island at 999  
11 Main St., and that “Alliance [Security] would install your system and monitor your system,  
12 [and] your phone app would be through alarm.com.”

13 90. In an email, Mr. Slaton confirmed this stating:

14 Yes, our mobile application is Powered by Alarm.com, a  
15 subscription to this application comes free with our service. So,  
16 when you have our service, you would download the alarm.com  
17 app from the iPhone app store. and use a login that we would  
provide you with at your installation, this way, you would have  
complete access to your system from anywhere, in the world  
straight from your iPhone.

18 91. Because Defendants permit their Service Providers, including Alliance Security,  
19 to contract for lead generation only with their written consent, Defendants provided apparent  
20 and actual authority through a subagency relationship for Nationwide to call Plaintiff Abante  
21 and to telemarket on Defendants’ behalf.

22 92. Plaintiff Abante did not provide prior express written consent to Defendants or  
23 any of their agents to receive prerecorded and/or ATDS-generated telephone calls on its cellular  
24 telephone line.

25 93. Plaintiff Abante’s privacy has been violated by the calls from, or on behalf of,  
26 Defendants as they constitute a nuisance and are annoying and harassing. Plaintiff Abante has  
27 had to use valuable cellular telephone minutes for which it paid to deal with these calls.

1           **G. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Manesiotis.**

2           94. In early 2014, Plaintiff Manesiotis' began receiving telemarketing calls on his  
3           cellular phone, (954) 857-XXXX, from or on behalf of Defendants.

4           95. On information and belief, these calls were made by a third party lead generator  
5           authorized by Defendants and Alliance Security to make illegal telemarketing calls to  
6           consumers.

7           96. Each call began with a distinctive pause consistent with an ATDS.

8           97. After the pause, a representative came on the line and asked Plaintiff Manesiotis a  
9           series of questions, including whether he owned his home.

10           98. When Plaintiff Manesiotis answered that he did not own his home, the caller  
11           would hang-up.

12           99. Frustrated with the repeated calls, after receiving approximately six calls, Plaintiff  
13           Manesiotis told a representative that he did own his home so he could determine who was  
14           calling him.

15           100. Plaintiff Manesiotis was then connected to a representative who stated the calls  
16           were on behalf of Alliance Security.

17           101. Plaintiff Manesiotis told the representative to stop calling him.

18           102. Nevertheless, Alliance Security continued to make numerous calls to Plaintiff  
19           Manesiotis' cellular phone.

20           103. On January 16, 2015, Plaintiff Manesiotis registered his cellular telephone on the  
21           National Do Not Call registry.

22           104. On February 3, 2015, Plaintiff Manesiotis posted a message to Alliance Security's  
23           Twitter account again requesting that they stop calling him. The message read: "@whyalliance  
24           Please consider the Do Not Call list. It exists for a reason. fcc.gov/guides/robocal[sic]...Robo  
25           calls are illegal!"

26           105. Alliance Security continued to call Plaintiff Manesiotis' cell phone on numerous  
27           occasions after he registered it on the National Do Not Call registry.

1       106. Plaintiff Manesiots did not provide prior express written consent to Defendants  
2 or any of their agents to receive ATDS generated telephone calls on his cellular telephone line.

3       107. Plaintiff Manesiots' privacy has been violated by the calls from or on behalf of  
4 Defendants, as they constitute a nuisance and are annoying and harassing. Plaintiff Manesiots  
5 has had to use valuable cellular telephone minutes for which he paid to deal with these calls.

6       108. Defendants are responsible for the above-described automated calls.

7 **H. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Hankins.**

8       109. On September 10, 2015, Plaintiff Hankins received a prerecorded telemarketing  
9 call on his residential telephone line, (813) 995-XXXX from the Caller ID number (330) 237-  
10 6658.

11       110. The call was an interactive pre-recorded message offering home security services,  
12 and provided automated options to reach live operators.

13       111. During this call, Plaintiff Hankins chose to be connected to a live operator and  
14 was transferred to an agent named Joseph Price, who offered to sell him a home security  
15 system.

16       112. Mr. Price specifically referenced Alarm.com in connection with the home security  
17 system he attempted to sell to Plaintiff Hankins.

18       113. Upon information and belief, the call was placed from or on behalf of the  
19 Defendants.

20       114. On October 5, 2015, Plaintiff Hankins received a second call from, or on behalf  
21 of, Defendants.

22       115. Plaintiff Hankins received this call on his cellular telephone, (813) 503-XXXX  
23 from Caller ID number (915) 321-3788.

24       116. The call was an interactive pre-recorded message from "Ashley" with "Prime  
25 Home Security" offering home security services. The message provided automated options to  
26 reach live operators.

1       117. Plaintiff Hankins chose to be connected to a live operator and was connected with  
2 “Doug” from “Prime Home Security.”

3       118. Doug attempted to sell Plaintiff Hankins a home security system that he stated  
4 would be installed by Alliance Security and uses Alarm.com for the application.

5       119. Because Defendants permit their Service Providers, including Alliance Security,  
6 to contract for lead generation only with Defendants’ written consent, Defendants provided  
7 apparent and actual authority through a subagency relationship with the entities that placed the  
8 calls to Plaintiff Hankins to telemarket on Defendants’ behalf.

9       120. Plaintiff Hankins did not provide prior express consent to Defendants or any of  
10 their agents to receive prerecorded telephone calls on his residential or cellular telephone lines.

11       121. Plaintiff Hankins’ privacy has been violated by the above-described calls from, or  
12 on behalf of, Defendants as they constitute a nuisance as they are annoying and harassing.  
13 Plaintiff Hankins has had to expend time and valuable cellular minutes, for which he paid, to  
14 respond to and investigate the source of these annoying, harassing, and illegal telemarketing  
15 calls.

16 **I. Factual Allegations Regarding Plaintiff Charvat.**

17       122. Plaintiff Charvat registered his residential telephone number, (614) 895-XXXX,  
18 on the National Do Not Call Registry on September 12, 2011.

19       123. Prior to August 3, 2015, Plaintiff Charvat requested that Defendants remove his  
20 residential telephone from Defendants’ call list.

21       124. Notwithstanding his presence on Defendants’ do-not-call list and the National Do  
22 Not Call Registry, Plaintiff Charvat began receiving calls from, or on behalf of, Defendants on  
23 September 3, 2015.

24       125. On September 3, 2015, Plaintiff Charvat received a call on his residential  
25 telephone number from “Jonathan” from “Home Security Center” offering to sell him a home  
26 security system.

1           126. After asking some introductory questions, Jonathan transferred Plaintiff Charvat  
2 to an agent named Gene Aucella.

3           127. Mr. Aucella initially identified his company as Monitronics, but stated in a later  
4 call that he was “with Alliance Security.”

5           128. Mr. Aucella asked if Plaintiff Charvat was interested in purchasing a home  
6 security system and asked if he could call back to discuss it further. Plaintiff Charvat did not  
7 give Mr. Aucella permission to call again.

8           129. Nevertheless, on September 8, 2015, Defendants again ignored Plaintiff Charvat’s  
9 registration on the National Do Not Call Registry and Defendants’ internal Do Not Call list,  
10 when Mr. Aucella called Plaintiff Charvat for a second time.

11           130. Mr. Aucella again asked Plaintiff Charvat if he was interested in purchasing a  
12 home security system and inquired about the size of his house and the number of doors.

13           131. Plaintiff Charvat, in an effort to determine what entity was responsible for the  
14 illegal telemarketing calls, asked if a dealer would come out to his house so that he could review  
15 the security system contract.

16           132. Mr. Aucella did not respond, but later that day, Plaintiff Charvat received another  
17 call on his residential telephone line from “Ashley,” who stated, “I’m with Alliance Security.”

18           133. The call disconnected and Ashley called back a short time later.

19           134. When she called back, Ashley noted that Plaintiff Charvat’s “number comes up  
20 on our do not call list” and asked if Plaintiff Charvat wanted to move forward with purchasing a  
21 home security system.

22           135. So he could determine who was behind the illegal telemarketing call, Plaintiff  
23 Charvat responded by requesting that a dealer come to his home so he could read over the  
24 contract.

25           136. Later that day, Plaintiff Charvat received his fifth and sixth calls from, or on  
26 behalf of Defendants.

1       137. During one of those calls, a representative named David confirmed that an agent  
2 named Joe from Alliance Security would come to his home to show him the security system  
3 contract.

4       138. On September 9, 2015, Joe Wyche from Alliance Security came to Plaintiff  
5 Charvat's home to discuss the home security system about which Plaintiff Charvat had received  
6 telemarketing calls.

7       139. Joe provided Plaintiff Charvat with a contract from Defendants.

8       140. That same day, Plaintiff Charvat received yet another call from, or on behalf of,  
9 Defendants.

10       141. During that call, Plaintiff Charvat asked the agent, David, why the contract he had  
11 received from Alliance Security listed Alarm.com on it.

12       142. David explained that Alliance Security would install the home security system  
13 and Alarm.com provided "the cellular system. Alarm.com is essentially the system that you  
14 dial on your phone."

15       143. Later that day, Plaintiff Charvat received yet another call from Gene "with  
16 Alliance Security."

17       144. All of the above-described calls occurred after Plaintiff Charvat had registered his  
18 residential telephone number with the National Do Not Call Registry, and after Plaintiff Charvat  
19 requested that Defendants remove his number from their call list.

20       145. Plaintiff Charvat's privacy has been violated by the above-described calls from, or  
21 on behalf of, Defendants as they constitute a nuisance as they are annoying and harassing.  
22 Plaintiff Charvat has had to expend valuable time responding to and investigating the source of  
23 these annoying, harassing, and illegal telemarketing calls.

24       146. Plaintiff Charvat did not provide prior express written consent to Defendants or  
25 any of their agents to receive telephone solicitation calls on his residential telephone line.

26       147. Plaintiff is not a customer of Alliance Security or Defendants.

1 148. Plaintiff never provided Alliance Security or Defendants with his personal  
2 information nor his residential telephone number.

## 3 VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

4 149. Class Definition. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and  
5 (b)(3), Plaintiffs bring this case as a class action on behalf of National Classes defined as  
6 follows:

7 Cell Phone Class: All persons in the United States to whom: (a)  
8 Defendants or a third party acting on Defendants' behalf, made one  
9 or more non-emergency telephone calls; (b) promoting  
10 Defendants' goods or services; (c) to their cellular telephone  
11 number; (d) through the use of an automatic telephone dialing  
12 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice; and (e) at any time in  
13 the period that begins four years before the date of filing this  
14 Complaint to trial.

15 Residential Class: All persons in the United States to whom: (a)  
16 Defendants or a third party acting on Defendants' behalf, initiated  
17 one or more non-emergency telephone calls; (b) promoting  
18 Defendants' goods or services; (c) to their residential telephone  
19 line; (d) through the use of an artificial or prerecorded voice; and  
20 (e) at any time in the period that begins four years before the date  
21 of filing this Complaint to trial.

22 Internal Do Not Call Class: All persons in the United States who:  
23 (a) received more than one telemarketing call, initiated by  
24 Defendants or on Defendants' behalf; (b) promoting Defendants'  
25 goods or services; (c) more than 30 days after requesting not to  
26 receive further calls; (d) in a 12-month period; (e) on their cellular  
27 or residential telephone line; and (f) at any time in the period that  
begins four years before the date of filing this Complaint to trial.

28 National Do Not Call Class: All persons in the United States who:  
29 (a) received more than one call, made by Defendants or on  
30 Defendants' behalf; (b) promoting Defendants' goods or services;  
31 (c) in a 12-month period; (d) on their cellular telephone line or  
32 residential telephone line; (e) whose cellular or residential  
33 telephone line number(s) appear on the National Do Not Call  
34 registry; and (f) at any time in the period that begins four years  
35 before the date of filing this Complaint to trial.

36 Excluded from Classes are Defendants, any entity in which Defendants have a controlling  
37 interest or that has a controlling interest in Defendants, and Defendants' legal representatives,  
38 assignees, and successors. Also excluded are the judge to whom this case is assigned and any  
39 member of the judge's immediate family.

1       150. Numerosity. The Classes are each so numerous that joinder of all members is  
2 impracticable. On information and belief, the Classes each have more than 1,000 members.  
3 Moreover, the disposition of the claims of the Classes in a single action will provide substantial  
4 benefits to all parties and the Court.

5       151. Commonality. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to  
6 Plaintiffs and members of the Classes. These common questions of law and fact include, but  
7 are not limited to, the following:

8           a.       As to Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins and the Cell Phone  
9 Class, whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting  
10 on Defendants' behalf violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) by making any call, except for  
11 emergency purposes, to a cellular telephone number using an ATDS or artificial or prerecorded  
12 voice;

13           b.       As to Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins and the Cell Phone  
14 Class, whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting  
15 on Defendants' behalf knowingly and/or willfully violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) by making  
16 any call, except for emergency purposes, to a cellular telephone number using an ATDS or  
17 artificial or prerecorded voice, thus entitling Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins and the  
18 Cell Phone Class to treble damages;

19           c.       As to Plaintiff Hankins and the Residential Class, whether Defendants  
20 and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf  
21 violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B) by initiating any call, except for emergency purposes, to a  
22 residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the  
23 prior express consent of the called party;

24           d.       As to Plaintiff Hankins and the Residential Class, whether Defendants  
25 and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf  
26 knowingly and/or willfully violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B) by initiating any telephone call to  
27 any residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message

1 without the prior express consent of the called party, unless the call is initiated for emergency  
2 purposes, thus entitling Plaintiff Hankins and the Residential Class to treble damages;

3 e. As to Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and the Internal Do-Not-Call  
4 Class, whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting  
5 on Defendants' behalf violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) by initiating any call for telemarketing  
6 purposes to Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and members of the Internal Do-Not-Call Class  
7 without following procedures for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive  
8 telemarketing calls;

9 f. As to Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and the Internal Do-Not-Call  
10 Class, whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting  
11 on Defendants' behalf knowingly and/or willfully violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) by failing to  
12 follow procedures for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive telemarketing calls  
13 in the future, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), thus entitling Plaintiffs Manesiots and  
14 Charvat and the Internal Do-Not-Call Class to treble damages;

15 g. As to Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and the National Do-Not-Call  
16 Class, whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting  
17 on Defendants' behalf violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) by initiating more than one telephone  
18 solicitation within a 12-month period to Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and members of the  
19 National Do-Not-Call Class who have registered their residential telephone numbers with the  
20 National Do-Not-Call Registry;

21 h. As to Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and the National Do-Not-Call  
22 Class, whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting  
23 on Defendants' behalf knowingly and/or willfully violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) by initiating  
24 more than one telephone solicitation within a 12-month period to Plaintiffs Manesiots and  
25 Charvat and members of the National Do-Not-Call Class who have registered their residential  
26 telephone numbers with the National Do-Not-Call Registry, thus entitling Plaintiffs Manesiots  
27 and Charvat and the National Do-Not-Call Class to treble damages;

i. Whether Defendants are vicariously liable for ATDS generated and/or automated or prerecorded calls promoting Defendants' products and/or services made by Defendants' affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf;

j. Whether Defendants are liable for telephone calls to persons on Defendants' internal do-not-call list made by Defendants' affiliates, agents, and/or other persons and entities acting of Defendants' behalf;

k. Whether Defendants are liable for telephone calls to persons on the National Do-Not-Call Registry made by Defendants' affiliates, agents, and/or other persons and entities acting on Defendants' behalf;

l. Whether Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf should be enjoined from violating the TCPA in the future.

152. Typicality. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Classes. Plaintiffs' claims, like the claims of Classes arise out of the same common course of conduct by Defendants and are based on the same legal and remedial theories.

153. Adequacy. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Classes. Plaintiffs have retained competent and capable attorneys with significant experience in complex and class action litigation, including consumer class actions and TCPA class actions. Plaintiffs and their counsel are committed to prosecuting this action vigorously on behalf of the Classes and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiffs nor their counsel have interests that are contrary to or that conflict with those of the proposed Classes.

154. Predominance. Defendants have engaged in a common course of conduct toward Plaintiffs and members of the Classes. The common issues arising from this conduct that affect Plaintiffs and members of the Classes predominate over any individual issues. Adjudication of these common issues in a single action has important and desirable advantages of judicial economy.

155. Superiority. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Classwide relief is essential to compel Defendants to comply

with the TCPA. The interest of individual members of the Classes in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because the damages in an individual action for violation of the TCPA are small. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than are presented in many class claims because the calls at issue are all automated. Class treatment is superior to multiple individual suits or piecemeal litigation because it conserves judicial resources, promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication, provides a forum for small claimants, and deters illegal activities. There will be no significant difficulty in the management of this case as a class action.

156. Injunctive and Declaratory Relief Appropriate. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Classes, thereby making final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Classes appropriate on a classwide basis. Moreover, on information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that the automated calls made by Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf that are complained of herein are substantially likely to continue in the future if an injunction is not entered.

## **VII. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**(Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) – Cellular Telephone Calls – Cell Phone Class)**

157. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

158. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to the cellular telephone numbers of Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins and members of the Cell Phone Class using an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice.

159. As a result of Defendants' and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A),

1 Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins and members of the Cell Phone Class are entitled to  
 2 an award of (a) \$500 in damages for each and every call to their cellular telephone numbers  
 3 using an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice in violation of the statute, pursuant to 47  
 4 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B), or (b) \$1,500 for each knowing or willful violation.

5 160. Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins and members of the Cell Phone Class  
 6 are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants and/or their affiliates,  
 7 agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf from violating the TCPA,  
 8 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to any cellular  
 9 telephone numbers using an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.

10 **VIII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

11 **(Violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B) –  
 12 Residential Telephone Line Calls – Residential Class)**

13 161. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth  
 in the preceding paragraphs.

14 162. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents,  
 15 and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf constitute numerous and multiple  
 16 violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B), by initiating calls, except for emergency  
 17 purposes, to the residential telephone lines of Plaintiff Hankins and members of the Residential  
 18 Class using an artificial or prerecorded voice.

19 163. As a result of Defendants' and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or  
 20 entities acting on Defendants' behalf violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B),  
 21 Plaintiff Hankins and members of the Residential Class presumptively are entitled to an award  
 22 of (a) \$500 in damages for calls to their residential telephone lines using an artificial or  
 23 prerecorded voice, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B), or (b) \$1,500 for each knowing or  
 24 willful violation.

25 164. Plaintiff Hankins and members of the Residential Class are also entitled to and do  
 26 seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons  
 27

1 or entities acting on Defendants' behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B), by  
 2 initiating calls, except for emergency purposes, to any residential telephone line using an  
 3 artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.

4 **IX. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 **(Violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) & 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) – Internal Do-Not-Call List –  
 Internal Do-Not-Call Class)**

6 165. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth  
 7 in the preceding paragraphs.

8 166. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents,  
 9 and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf constitute numerous and multiple  
 10 violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d), by initiating any call for telemarketing purposes to  
 11 Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and members of the Internal Do-Not-Call Class, without  
 12 following procedures for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive telemarketing  
 13 calls ("internal do-not-call list"). This includes Defendants' failure to properly record do-not-  
 14 call requests, failure to maintain a record of do-not-call requests, and failure to honor do-not-  
 15 call requests.

167. As a result of Defendants' and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or  
 17 entities acting on Defendants' behalf violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d), Plaintiffs Manesiots  
 18 and Charvat and members of the Internal Do-Not-Call Class are entitled to an award of (a) \$500  
 19 in statutory damages for each and every call in violation of the internal do-not-call list  
 20 regulation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B), or (b) \$1,500 for each knowing or willful  
 21 violation.

168. Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat and members of the Internal Do-Not-Call Class  
 23 are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants and/or their affiliates,  
 24 agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf from violating 47 C.F.R.  
 25 § 64.1200(d) by failing to follow procedures for maintaining a list of persons who request not to  
 26 receive telemarketing calls in the future, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A).

## **X. FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**(Violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) & 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) – National Do-Not-Call Registry – National Do-Not-Call Class)**

169. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

170. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c), by initiating more than one telephone solicitation within a 12-month period to Plaintiffs Manesiotis and Charvat and members of the National Do-Not-Call Class who have registered their telephone numbers with the National Do-Not-Call Registry.

171. As a result of Defendants' and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c), Plaintiffs Manesiotsis and Charvat and members of the National Do-Not-Call Class are entitled to an award of (a) \$500 in statutory damages for each and every call initiated to them, after registering their telephone numbers with the National Do-Not-Call Registry, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B), or (b) \$1,500 for each knowing or willful violation.

172. Plaintiffs Manesiotis and Charvat and members of the National Do-Not-Call Class are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendants' behalf from violating 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) by initiating more than one telephone solicitation to any residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or her telephone numbers with the National Do-Not-Call Registry in the future, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A).

## XI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on their own behalf and on behalf of the members of the Classes, request judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. That the Court certify the proposed Classes;
- B. That the Court appoint Plaintiffs Manesiotis, Abante, and Hankins as representatives of the Cell Phone Class;

1       C.     That the Court appoint Plaintiff Hankins as representative of the Residential  
2 Class;

3       D.     That the Court appoint Plaintiffs Manesiots and Charvat as representatives of the  
4 Internal Do-Not-Call Class, and the National Do-Not-Call Class.

5       E.     That the Court appoint the undersigned counsel as counsel for the Classes;

6       F.     That the Court enter a judgment permanently enjoining the Defendants from  
7 engaging in or relying upon telemarketing, or, alternatively, from engaging in or relying upon  
8 telemarketing that violates the TCPA;

9       G.     That, should the Court permit the Defendants to engage in or rely on  
10 telemarketing, it enter a judgment requiring them to adopt measures to ensure TCPA compliance,  
11 and that the Court retain jurisdiction for a period of six months to ensure that the Defendants  
12 comply with those measures;

13       H.     That the Court enter a judgment awarding any other injunctive relief necessary to  
14 ensure the Defendants' compliance with the TCPA;

15       I.     That the Court enter a judgment finding that Defendants are vicariously liable to  
16 Plaintiffs and all class members for all violations arising from the calls;

17       J.     That the Court enter a judgment finding that Defendants are jointly and severally  
18 liable to Plaintiff and all class members for all violations arising from the calls;

19       K.     That Defendants and their agents, or anyone acting on their behalves, be  
20 immediately restrained from altering, deleting or destroying any documents or records that could  
21 be used to identify class members;

22       L.     That the Plaintiff and all class members be awarded statutory damages of \$500 for  
23 each negligent violation of the TCPA, and \$1,500 for each knowing violation;

24       M.     That the Court enter an order awarding the Plaintiffs reasonable attorneys' fees  
25 and costs; and

26       N.     That the Plaintiffs and all class members be granted other relief as is just and  
27 equitable under the circumstances.



Edward A. Broderick  
Anthony I. Paronich  
**BRODERICK LAW, P.C.**  
99 High Street, Suite 304  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Telephone: (617) 738-7080  
Facsimile: (617) 830-0327  
Email: [ted@broderick-law.com](mailto:ted@broderick-law.com)  
Email: [anthony@broderick-law.com](mailto:anthony@broderick-law.com)

Matthew P. McCue  
THE LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW P. McCUE  
1 South Avenue, Suite 3  
Natick, Massachusetts 01760  
Telephone: (508) 655-1415  
Facsimile: (508) 319-3077  
E-mail: [mmccue@massattorneys.net](mailto:mmccue@massattorneys.net)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*